

Measuring Neutrino Mixing Parameters with a Wide band Super Neutrino Beam

Patrick Huber, Vernon Barger

University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

Danny Marfatia

University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas

Mary Bishai, Mark Dierckxsens, Milind V. Diwan, Brett Viren

Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York

Christine Lewis

Columbia University, New York, New York

Abstract

In this paper we will discuss how a high energy wide band super neutrino beam produced with conventional technology could be used to further our understanding of neutrino masses and mixings. We compare the physics sensitivity that could be obtained to other techniques taking into account errors and correlations between all mixing parameters. For this calculation we use new numerical simulation tools (GLOBES) that allow proper comparison between different approaches. We describe the possibility of building such a beam at existing high energy accelerator laboratories. We point out that such a project couples naturally to a large (> 100 kT) multipurpose detector in a new deep underground laboratory. We discuss the requirements for both the accelerator and the detector. Since the number of sites for both an accelerator laboratory and a deep laboratory are limited, we discuss how the choice of baseline affects the physics sensitivities, the practical issues of beam construction, and event rates.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

In [1] we argued that an intense broadband muon neutrino beam and a large detector located more than 2000 km away from the source could be used to perform precision measurements of neutrino properties such as the mass differences, the mass hierarchy, the mixing parameters, and CP violation in the neutrino sector. Using the currently deduced neutrino mass differences and mixing parameters [2] and the same formalism as [1] we formulated several simple rules for such an experiment:

For precise measurements of Δm_{32}^2 and $\sin^2 2\theta_{23}$, it is desirable to observe a pattern of multiple nodes in the energy spectrum of muon neutrinos. Since the cross section, Fermi motion, and nuclear effects limit the resolution of muon neutrino interactions below ~ 1 GeV, we need to utilize a wide band muon neutrino beam with energy range of 1-6 GeV and a distance of ~ 2000 km to observe 3 or more oscillation nodes. See Fig. 1.

The appearance spectrum of electron neutrinos from the conversion $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ contains information about $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$, δ_{CP} , Δm_{21}^2 and the ordering of neutrino masses through the matter effect (i.e. $(m_1 < m_2 < m_3)$ versus $(m_3 < m_1 < m_2)$). We showed that the effects of the various parameters can be separated using the broad-band 1-6 GeV beam and the ~ 2000 km distance. The matter effect causes the conversion probability to rise with energy and is mostly confined to energies > 3 GeV whereas the effects of δ_{CP} fall as $1/E$. We showed that this energy dependence can be used to measure the value of δ_{CP} and $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ without taking data with anti-neutrinos.

The additional contribution to the appearance event rate due to 3-generation CP violation in the neutrino sector is approximately proportional to: $\sin \delta_{CP} \sin 2\theta_{13} \times (\Delta m_{21}^2 L / 4E_\nu)$. This contribution increases linearly with distance while the total flux falls as $1/L^2$ for a detector of a given size. The statistical sensitivity for the additional CP contribution, however, remains approximately independent of distance. It is therefore advantageous to perform the experiment with a very long (> 2000 km) baseline because then we can relax the requirements on systematic errors on the flux, the cross sections, the other oscillation parameters, and the calculation of the matter effect.

Because of the electron neutrino contamination background in a conventional accelerator neutrino beam the sensitivity to δ_{CP} will be limited to the parameter region $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} > 0.01$. The main CP-conserving contribution to the $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ signal is proportional to $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ in this region. The CP-violating term, on the other hand, is linear in $\sin 2\theta_{13}$. Therefore the fractional contribution due to the CP-violating term increases for small $\sin 2\theta_{13}$, although the total appearance signal decreases. The statistical sensitivity to the CP-violating term remains approximately independent of the value of $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ as long as backgrounds do not dominate the observed spectrum [3]. When $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ is very small (< 0.002) this rule no longer holds because the signal is no longer dominated by the $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ term in the 3-generation formalism [4].

Current generation of accelerator experiments such as K2K [5], MINOS [6], or CNGS [7] focus on obtaining a definitive signature of muon neutrino oscillations at the first node ($\Delta m_{32}^2 L / 4E \sim \pi/2$) for the atmospheric mass scale. Other recent proposed projects (JPARC-to-SK, NUMI-offaxis) [8, 9] also focus mainly on the first node, but propose to use an off-axis narrow band beam to lower the background in the search of $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ caused by a non-zero θ_{13} . The narrow band beam and limited statistics, however, do not allow measurement of the parameters in a definitive way. Proposed reactor disappearance searches, also at the first node for the atmospheric mass scale, are only sensitive to $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ [4].




FIG. 1: Nodes of oscillations for $\Delta m_{32}^2 = 0.0025 eV^2$ in neutrino energy versus baseline (left). Possible baselines from Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) and Fermi National Laboratory (FNAL) to the Homestake underground site are indicated. They correspond to distances of ~ 2540 km and ~ 1290 km, respectively. Right hand side shows the wide band neutrino spectrum from 28 GeV protons at a distance of 1 km from the target. The anti-neutrino spectrum looks similar, but has contamination from neutrinos.

Thus, current and near term accelerator based experiments are focussed on the atmospheric mass scale. Experiments using astrophysical sources such as solar neutrinos or atmospheric neutrinos are sensitive to either the solar or the atmospheric mass scale. The parameters are now known well enough ($\Delta m_{32}^2 \sim 0.0025 eV^2$ and $\Delta m_{21}^2 \sim 8 \times 10^{-5} eV^2$) [10–12] that it is possible to design a qualitatively different experiment that will have good sensitivity to both mass scales. The CP contribution is dependent on both atmospheric and solar Δm^2 ; it is also likely that such an experiment is necessary to uncover any new physics in neutrino mixing or interactions with matter. A next generation accelerator experiment with well understood, pure beams, sufficiently long baseline, and low energy wide band beam

(1-5 GeV) could fill this role.

In this paper we will discuss different options for the baseline. In [1] we demonstrated that for 3-generation mixing the CP parameters could be measured using neutrino data alone. Any additional information from anti-neutrino running therefore could make the measurements more precise as well as constrain contributions from new physics, in particular, new interactions in matter or new sources of CP violation in the neutrino sector. We will calculate the significance with which the neutrino mass and mixing parameters can be measured using both neutrino and anti-neutrino data and the implications for the determination of the mass hierarchy and demonstration of CP violation.

II. ACCELERATOR AND DETECTOR REQUIREMENTS

Previously we described the BNL Alternating Gradient Synchrotron (AGS) operating at 28 GeV upgraded to provide total proton beam power of 1 MW [13] and a 500 kTon detector placed at the proposed national underground laboratory (NUSEL) [14] in the Homestake mine in South Dakota. The main components of the accelerator upgrade at BNL are a new 1.2 GeV Superconducting LINAC to provide protons to the existing AGS, and new magnet power supplies to increase the ramp rate of the AGS magnetic field from about 0.5 Hz of today to 2.5 Hz. For 1 MW operation the protons from the accelerator will be delivered in pulses of 9×10^{13} protons at 2.5 Hz. We have determined that 2 MW operation of the AGS is also possible by further upgrading the synchrotron to 5 Hz repetition rate and with further modifications to the LINAC and the RF systems. The neutrino beam will be built with conventional horn focussed technology and a 200 m long pion decay tunnel.

High energy multi-MW proton beams are also under consideration at FNAL. The most ambitious plans [15] call for a 8 GeV superconducting LINAC that can provide 1.5×10^{14} H^- ions at 10 Hz corresponding to 2 MW of total beam power. Some of these 8 GeV ions could be injected into the main injector (MI) to provide 2 MW proton beam power at any energy between 40 and 120 GeV; for example, 40 GeV at 2 Hz or 120 GeV at 0.67 Hz. Such a plan allows much flexibility in the choice of proton energy for neutrino production. As Figure 1 shows for observing multiple oscillation nodes in muon neutrino oscillations it is necessary to have a wide band beam with energies from 1 to 5 GeV. Protons above ~ 20 GeV are needed to provide such a flux, clearly possible at either BNL or FNAL. For the purposes of the analysis in this paper we will assume that the spectrum from either the BNL or the FNAL beam will be the same. This will allow us a proper comparison of the physics issues regarding the baselines.

If a large detector facility (as a part of NUSEL) [16–18] is located at Homestake (HS) the beam from BNL (FNAL) will have to traverse 2540km (1290km) through the earth. At BNL the beam would have to be built at an incline angle of about 11.3° . Current design for such a beam calls for the construction of a hill with a height of about 50 m [13]. Such a hill will have the proton target at the top of the hill and a 200 m long decay tunnel on the downslope. At FNAL the inclination will be about 5.7° . There is already experience at FNAL in building the NUMI beam [6]; this experience could be extended to build a new beam to HS. In either case, it is adequate to have a short decay tunnel (200 m) compared to the NUMI tunnel (750 m) to achieve the needed flux. The option of running with a narrow band beam using the off-axis technique [19] could be preserved if the decay tunnel is made sufficiently wide. For example, a 4 m diameter tunnel could allow one to move and rotate

the target and horn assembly so that a 1° off-axis beam could be sent to the far detector.

With 1 MW of beam, a baseline of 2540 km, and a 500kT detector we calculate that we would obtain ~ 60000 muon charged current and ~ 20000 neutral current events for $5 \times 10^7 \text{sec}$ of running in the neutrino mode in the absence of oscillations. For the same running conditions in the anti-neutrino mode (with the horn current reversed) we calculate a total of ~ 19000 anti-muon charged current and ~ 7000 neutral current events; approximately 20% of the event rate in the anti-neutrino beam will be due to wrong-sign neutrino interactions. For the shorter baseline of 1290 km from FNAL to HS, the event rates will be higher by a factor of $(2540/1290)^2$. For both neutrino and anti-neutrino running approximately $\sim 0.7\%$ of the charged current rate will be from electron charged current events which form a background to the $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ search. It will be desirable to obtain similar numbers of events in the anti-neutrino and the neutrino beam. Therefore, for the calculations in this paper we assume 1 MW operation for $5 \times 10^7 \text{sec}$ in the neutrino mode and 2 MW operation for $5 \times 10^7 \text{sec}$ in the anti-neutrino mode.

A large detector facility at NUSEL will most likely be used for a broad range of physics goals. Important considerations for such a detector are the fiducial mass, energy threshold, energy resolution, muon/electron discrimination, pattern recognition capability, time resolution, depth of the location, and the cost. Two classes of detectors are under consideration: water Cherenkov detector instrumented with photo-multiplier tubes and a liquid Argon based time projection chamber.

A water Cherenkov detector built in the same manner as the super-Kamiokande experiment (with 20 inch photo-multipliers placed on the inside detector surface covering approximately 40% of the total area) [20] can achieve the 500 kT mass. This could be done by simply scaling the super-Kamiokande detector to larger size or by building several detector modules[16, 17]. Such a detector placed underground at NUSEL could have a low energy threshold (< 10 MeV), good energy resolution ($< 10\%$) for single particles, good muon/electron separation ($< 1\%$), and time resolution ($< \text{few ns}$). For the experiment we propose here it is important to obtain good energy resolution on the neutrino energy. This can be achieved in a water Cherenkov detector by separating quasi-elastic scattering events with well identified leptons in the final state from the rest of the charged current events. The fraction of quasi-elastic events in the total charged current rate with the spectrum used in this paper is about 23% for the neutrino beam and 39% for the anti-neutrino beam. Separation of quasi-elastic events from the charged current background is being used by the K2K experiment [5]. Further work is needed to make this event reconstruction work at higher energies. The reconstruction algorithm could be enhanced by the addition of ring imaging techniques to the detector[21].

A number of proponents have argued that a liquid Argon time projection chamber (LARTPC) could be built with total mass approaching 100 kT [18]. A fine grained detector such as this has much better resolution for separating tracks. It is possible therefore to use a large fraction of the charged current cross section (rather than only the quasi-elastic events) for determining the neutrino energy spectrum. The LARTPC will also have much better particle identification capability. Therefore, a LARTPC with a smaller total fiducial mass of ~ 100 kT than the 500 kT assumed for the water Cherenkov tank is expected to have similar performance for the physics.

For the purposes of this paper we will assume the same detector performance as described in [1]. For the physics sensitivity calculated in this paper we will assume 1 MW operation for $5 \times 10^7 \text{sec}$ in the neutrino mode and 2 MW operation for $5 \times 10^7 \text{sec}$ in the anti-neutrino

Baseline	Events with Oscillations	No Oscillations
2500	6000	13000

TABLE I: *Expected event rates for three possible baselines.*

mode. In both cases we will assume a detector fiducial mass of 500 kT. With the running times, the accelerator power level, and the detector mass fixed, we will consider two baselines: 1290 km (for FNAL to Homestake) and 2540 km (for BNL to Homestake) assuming that the detector is located at Homestake.

Lastly, we note that for this analysis the far detector could be at several comparable sites in the western US, notably WIPP or the Henderson mine in Colorado. While the detailed calculations change, the qualitative results are easily deduced from this work for other locations.

III. ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES

This one can, maybe, also go to an appendix. Usually we have here a short reminder of what goes into the χ^2 , which central values and errors for the oscillation parameters are used, etc.

For the plots the following values were used, the errors are Gaußian 1σ errors:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{12} &= 0.55 \pm 10\%, & \Delta m_{21}^2 &= (8.0 \pm 0.8) \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2, \\ \theta_{23} &= \pi/4 \pm 5\%, & \Delta m_{31}^2 &= (2.5 \pm 0.125) \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2,\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

and a 5% error on the matter density.

For the beam I used following assumptions: $5 \cdot 10^7$ s of neutrino and anti-neutrino running each, and a power of 1 MW.

IV. ν_μ DISAPPEARANCE

We propose to use clean single muon events [1] and calculate the neutrino energy from the energy and angle of these muons assuming they are all from quasi-elastic interactions. The expected event rates are shown in Table I; the simulation includes effects of Fermi motion, detector resolution, and backgrounds from non-quasielastic events.

A great advantage of the very long baseline and multiple oscillation pattern in the spectrum is that the effect of systematic errors from flux normalization, background subtraction, and spectrum distortion due to nuclear effects or detector calibration can be small. Nevertheless, since the statistics and the size of the expected distortion of the spectrum are both large in the disappearance measurement, the final error on the precise determination of the parameters will most likely have significant contribution from systematic errors. In Figure ?? we show the 1 sigma resolutions that could be achieved on Δm_{32}^2 and $\sin^2 2\theta_{23}$. The black lines (labeled (1)) show the resolutions for purely statistical errors. For the red lines (labeled (2)) we have included a 5% bin-to-bin systematic uncertainty in the spectrum shape and a 5% systematic uncertainty in the overall normalization. These uncertainties could include modeling of cross sections or knowledge of the background spectra. For the Δm_{32}^2 resolutions we also show the expected resolution for an additional systematic error of 1% on the global energy scale (blue line labeled (3)). This uncertainty for the Super Kamioka water Cherenkov detector is estimated to be 2.5% in the multi-GeV region [20].

Although the resolution on Δm_{32}^2 will be dominated by systematic errors for the proposed experimental arrangement, a measurement approaching 1–2% precision can clearly be made. On the other hand, the resolution on $\sin^2 2\theta_{23}$ is dominated by the statistical power at the first node. This results in a factor of ~ 2 better resolution with 1290 km than with 2540 km using the same sized detector.

Running in the anti-neutrino mode with 2 MW of beam power will yield approximately the same spectra and resolutions on Δm_{32}^2 and $\sin^2 2\theta_{23}$. By comparing the measurements with the results from neutrino running a test of CPT is possible. In such a comparison many systematic errors, such as the global energy scale, common to the neutrino and anti-neutrino data sets should cancel yielding a comparison with errors less than 1%.

Finally, we remark that it is important to make precision measurements of both Δm_{32}^2 and $\sin^2 2\theta_{23}$ not only because they are fundamental parameters, but also because they are needed for interpreting the appearance ($\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$) result. Knowledge of both Δm_{21}^2 and Δm_{32}^2 are essential in fitting the shape of the appearance signal to extract other parameters. In addition, it will be very important to definitively understand if $\sin^2 2\theta_{23}$ is close to 1.0 or is < 1.0 . If $\sin^2 2\theta_{23} < 1.0$ then there will be an ambiguity in $\theta_{23} \rightarrow \pi/2 - \theta_{23}$. As we will describe below this ambiguity will affect the interpretation of the appearance spectrum.

V. ν_e APPEARANCE

Assuming a constant matter density, the oscillation of $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ in the Earth for 3-generation mixing is described approximately by the following equation [22]

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e) \approx & \sin^2 \theta_{23} \frac{\sin^2 2\theta_{13}}{(\hat{A} - 1)^2} \sin^2((\hat{A} - 1)\Delta) \\
& + \alpha \frac{\sin \delta_{CP} \cos \theta_{13} \sin 2\theta_{12} \sin 2\theta_{13} \sin 2\theta_{23}}{\hat{A}(1 - \hat{A})} \sin(\Delta) \sin(\hat{A}\Delta) \sin((1 - \hat{A})\Delta) \\
& + \alpha \frac{\cos \delta_{CP} \cos \theta_{13} \sin 2\theta_{12} \sin 2\theta_{13} \sin 2\theta_{23}}{\hat{A}(1 - \hat{A})} \cos(\Delta) \sin(\hat{A}\Delta) \sin((1 - \hat{A})\Delta) \\
& + \alpha^2 \frac{\cos^2 \theta_{23} \sin^2 2\theta_{12}}{\hat{A}^2} \sin^2(\hat{A}\Delta)
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $\alpha = \Delta m_{21}^2 / \Delta m_{31}^2$, $\Delta = \Delta m_{31}^2 L / 4E$, $\hat{A} = 2VE / \Delta m_{31}^2$, $V = \sqrt{2}G_F n_e$. n_e is the density of electrons in the Earth. Recall that $\Delta m_{31}^2 = \Delta m_{32}^2 + \Delta m_{21}^2$. Also notice that $\hat{A}\Delta = LG_F n_e / \sqrt{2}$ is sensitive to the sign of Δm_{31}^2 . For anti-neutrinos, the second term in Equation 2 has the opposite sign. It is proportional to the following CP violating quantity.

$$J_{CP} \equiv \sin \theta_{12} \sin \theta_{23} \sin \theta_{13} \cos \theta_{12} \cos \theta_{23} \cos^2 \theta_{13} \sin \delta_{CP} \tag{3}$$

Equation 2 is an expansion in powers of α . The approximation becomes inaccurate for $\Delta m_{32}^2 L / 4E > \pi/2$ as well as $\alpha \sim 1$. For the actual results we have used the exact numerical calculation, accurate to all orders. Nevertheless, the approximate formula is useful for understanding important features of the appearance probability: 1) the first 3 terms in the equation control the matter induced enhancement for regular mass ordering (RO) ($m_1 < m_2 < m_3$) or suppression for the unnatural or reversed mass ordering (UO) ($m_3 < m_1 < m_2$) of the oscillation probability above 3 GeV; 2) the second and third terms control the sensitivity to CP in the intermediate 1 to 3 GeV range; and 3) the last term controls the sensitivity to Δm_{21}^2 at low energies.

The ν_e signal will consist of clean, single electron events (single showering rings in a water Cherenkov detector) that result mostly from the quasi-elastic reaction $\nu_e + n \rightarrow e^- + p$. The main backgrounds will be from the electron neutrino contamination in the beam and reactions that have a π^0 in the final state. The π^0 background will depend on how well the detector can distinguish events with single electron induced and two photon induced electromagnetic showers. Assuming the same detector performance as in [1] we calculate the expected electron neutrino and anti-neutrino spectra shown in Figure ???. These spectra were calculated for the parameters indicated in the figures for the regular mass ordering (RO). For the reversed mass ordering (UO) the anti-neutrino (neutrino) spectrum will (not) have the large matter enhancement at higher energies. The dependence of the total event rate on the CP phase parameter is the same for RO and UO in either running mode.




FIG. 2: Discovery potential for $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} \neq 0$ at a baseline of 2 500 km. Shown are lines of constant χ^2 , the black lines are from left to right 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 σ and the grey line show an increase of χ^2 by 1. For all points to right of the rightmost black line a non-zero value of $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ can be established with at least 5 σ significance.




FIG. 3: Schematic explanation of how-to derive the CP fraction. In a first step the result in the $\theta_{13} - \delta$ plane, as e.g. shown in figure 2, is used to determine for each value of $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ the CP fraction, i.e. the fraction of all CP phases for which there is sensistity at the given confidence level (black arrows). Repeating this for all possible values of $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ yields the figure shown in the middle panel. In the last step one chooses a set of values for the CP fraction and translates them into values of $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ by using the result from step two.




FIG. 4: *Discovery reach for $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} \neq 0$ at 3σ confidence level for CP fractions 0 (lowermost line, best case), 0.5 (middle line) and 1 (uppermost line, worst case) as a function of the baseline. The detector mass, beam power and exposure are constant.*

A. θ_{13} sensitivity

B. Resolution of the mass hierarchy

C. δ_{CP} phase measurement

If there is no excess of electron events observed then we can set a limit on the value of $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ as a function of δ_{CP} . Such 95 and 99% C.L. sensitivity limits are shown in Figure ???. These set of plots illustrate various considerations that must be evaluated for the very long baseline project. After running initially in the neutrino mode with 1 MW of beam power, if an excess signal is found then a measurement of δ_{CP} versus $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ can be made as shown in Figure ??, at the same time the mass hierarchy is determined from the strength of the signal in the higher energy region. If there is no signal in the neutrino mode then either θ_{13} is too small for the regular mass hierarchy (RO) or the mass hierarchy is reversed (UO) and parameters are in the “unlucky” region ($-140^\circ < \delta_{CP} < 30^\circ$). For the shorter baseline of 1290 km, the θ_{13} sensitivity for the reversed hierarchy is not reduced as much as for 2540 km because both the CP-sensitivity and the matter effect are weaker. Although this yields a better limit for $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ in the absence of signal, it affects the precision on δ_{CP} and the determination of the mass hierarchy.

If there is no signal in the neutrino mode, we will run in the anti-neutrino mode to cover the “unlucky” parameter space for the appearance signal. A combination of neutrino and anti-neutrino running will yield a stringent limit approaching $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} \sim 0.003$ independent of the value of δ_{CP} . The simulation results shown here include wrong sign contamination in both the background and signal for anti-neutrinos. Interestingly, since more than 20%




FIG. 5: *Discovery potential for a normal mass hierarchy at a baseline of 2 500 km. Shown are lines of constant χ^2 , the black lines are from left to right 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 σ and the grey line show an increase of χ^2 by 1. For all points to right of the rightmost black line normal hierarchy can be established with at least 5 σ significance.*




FIG. 6: *Discovery reach for normal mass hierarchy at 3 σ confidence level for CP fractions 0 (lowermost line, best case), 0.5 (middle line) and 1 (uppermost line, worst case) as a function of the baseline. The detector mass, beam power and exposure are constant.*




FIG. 7: *Discovery potential for CP violation at a baseline of 2500 km. Shown are lines of constant χ^2 , the black lines are from left to right 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 σ and the grey line show an increase of χ^2 by 1. For all points to right of the rightmost black line CP violation can be established with at least 5 σ significance.*




FIG. 8: *Discovery reach for CP violation at 3 σ confidence level for CP fractions 0 (lowermost line, best case), 0.5 (middle line) and 0.75 (uppermost line) as a function of the baseline. The detector mass, beam power and exposure are constant.*

of the event rate in the anti-neutrino case actually arises from the neutrino contamination, the $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ limit in the anti-neutrino case exhibits less dependence on δ_{CP} and the mass hierarchy. If there is a signal in the neutrino mode, we will get the first measurement of δ_{CP} from neutrino data alone in the 3-generation model, but it will still be important to run in the anti-neutrino mode for better precision, over-constraints on the 3-generation model, and search for possible new physics either in the mixing or in the interactions of neutrinos.

In Figure ?? we show the 90% confidence level interval in the δ_{CP} versus $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ plane from neutrino running alone for the two baselines. We have chosen the point $\delta_{CP} = 45^\circ$ and $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.04$ as an example. At this test point for the regular mass hierarchy, the resolution on δ_{CP} is $\sim \pm 20^\circ$. The mass hierarchy is also resolved at > 5 sigma because of the large enhancement of the spectrum at higher energies. As we pointed out in the introduction, the resolution on the CP phase is approximately independent of the baseline. The major difference between the 1290 and 2540 km baselines is that the shorter baseline has higher correlation between the parameters, δ_{CP} and $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$, has better resolution on $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$, and has worse sensitivity to systematic errors on the background and the spectrum shape. If the systematic errors exceed 10%, the shorter baseline will most likely have worse performance for measuring the CP parameter.

The sensitivity to systematic errors and the dependence on the mass hierarchy can be relieved by using data from both neutrino and anti-neutrino running. Figure ?? shows the 90% confidence level interval for 32 test points in the δ_{CP} and $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ plane after both neutrino and anti-neutrino data. A number of observations can be made: Figure ?? is for the regular mass hierarchy. The plot for the reversed mass hierarchy is similar. After both neutrino and anti-neutrino data the hierarchy will be resolved to more than 10 sigma (somewhat less significance for the shorter baseline) for $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ as small as 0.01. The resolution on δ_{CP} is seen to be approximately independent of $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ for $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} > 0.01$. When $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ is so small that the background becomes dominant, the δ_{CP} resolution becomes poor. The resolution on δ_{CP} is seen to be approximately the same for 2540 and 1290 km, except for small $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ where large statistics at 1290 km are seen to overcome the background. The resolution on $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ is, however, better for the shorter baseline because the sensitivity comes from the first node of oscillations which has much higher statistics at the shorter baseline.




FIG. 9: *Discovery reach for the octant of θ_{23} at 3σ confidence level for CP fractions 0 (lowermost line, best case), 0.5 (middle line) and 1 (uppermost line, worst case) as a function of the baseline. The lefthand panel is for a true value $\theta_{23} = 0.62$, whereas the righthand panel is for a true value $\theta_{23} = 0.96$. The detector mass, beam power and exposure are constant.*

D. Determining the octant of θ_{23}

E. Correlations with other parameters

F. Comments on the main results

1. *Dependence on background and systematics*
2. *Dependence on the neutrino spectrum and proton energy*

VI. CONCLUSION

This work was supported by DOE grant DE-AC02-98CH10886.

-
- [1] “Very Long Baseline Neutrino Oscillation Experiment for Precise Measurements of Mixing Parameters and CP Violating Effects”, M. V. Diwan, *et al.*, **PRD** **68** (2003) 012002.
 - [2] PDG, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 010001 (2002), p. 281.
 - [3] W. Marciano, hep-ph/0108181, 22 Aug. 2001.
 - [4] Stephen Parke, Talk in the HQL04 conference, Puerto Rico, June 1-June5, 2004.
 - [5] S. H. Ahn *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B** **511** 178 (2001).
 - [6] Numi MINOS project at Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, <http://www.numi.fnal.gov/>

- [7] The CERN Neutrino beam to Gran Sasso (Conceptual Technical Design), Ed. K. Elsener, CERN 98-02, INFN/AE-98/05, <http://proj-cnsgs.web.cern.ch/proj-cnsgs/>
- [8] The JHF-Kamioka neutrino project, Y. Itow et al., arXiv:hep-ex/0106019, June 2001.
- [9] Letter of Intent to build an Off-axis Detector to study ν_{μ} to ν_{τ} oscillations with the NuMI Neutrino Beam, D. Ayres *et al.*, hep-ex/0210005.
- [10] Y. Fukuda et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1562 (1998); S. Fukuda et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** 5656, 2001; E.W. Beier, Phys. Lett. **B283**, 446 (1992); T. Kajita and Y. Totsuka, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 85 (2001).
- [11] K. Eguchi, *et. al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 021802 (2003). hep-ex/0212021.
- [12] Q. R. Ahmad et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** 071301 (2001). S. Fukuda et al., Phys. Rev. Lett., **86** 5651 (2001).
- [13] J. Alessi *et al.*, AGS Super Neutrino Beam Facility, Accelerator and Target system Design, BNL-71228-2003-IR. April 15, 2003. <http://nwg.phy.bnl.gov/>
- [14] Neutrinos and Beyond: New Windows on Nature, Neutrino Facilities Assessment Committee, National Research Council, (2003), ISBN-0-309-087 16-3, <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10583.html>.
- [15] R. Alber, et al., Accelerator Proton Driver Study Group FNAL-TM-2136, FNAL-TM-2169. <http://www-bd.fnal.gov/pdriver/>
- [16] Megaton Modular Multi-Purpose Neutrino detector, 3M collaboration, <http://www.hep.upenn.edu/Homestake>
- [17] Physics Potential and Feasibility of UNO, UNO collaboration, June 2001, Stony Brook University, SBHEP01-03.
- [18] D.B. Cline, F. Segiampietri, J.G. Learned, K.T. McDonald, *LANNDD, A Massive Liquid Argon Detector for Proton Decay, Supernova and Solar neutrino Studies, and a Neutrino Factory Detector* May 24, 2001, astro-ph/0105442; F. Arneodo et al., Nucl. Instrum. Meth. **A471** 272-275 (2000).
- [19] The “off-axis” neutrino beam was first proposed by the E889 Collaboration, Physics Design Report, BNL No. 52459, April, 1995. <http://minos.phy.bnl.gov/nwg/papers/E889>.
- [20] S. Fukuda et al., Nucl. Instrm. Meth. A **501**, (2003) 418-462.
- [21] P. Antonioli et al., Nuclear Instrm. Methods **A433** 104-120, (1999).
- [22] M. Freund, Phys.Rev. D64 (2001) 053003; M. Freund, P. Huber, M. Lindner, Nucl.Phys. B615

- (2001) 331-357;
- [23] V.D. Barger, S. Geer, R. Raja, K. Whisnant, Phys. Rev. D63: 113011 (2001); V. Barger et al., hep-ph/0103052; P. Huber, M. Lindner, W. Winter, Nucl. Phys. B645, 3 (2002); V. Barger, D. Marfatia, K. Whisnant, Phys. Rev. D65: 073023 (2002).